

THE HOROFUNCTION BOUNDARY OF FINITE-DIMENSIONAL NORMED SPACES

CORMAC WALSH

ABSTRACT. We determine the set of Busemann points of an arbitrary finite-dimensional normed space. These are the points of the horofunction boundary that are the limits of “almost-geodesics”. We prove that all points in the horofunction boundary are Busemann points if and only if the set of extreme sets of the dual unit ball is closed in the Painlevé–Kuratowski topology.

1. INTRODUCTION

In [5], Gromov defines a boundary of a metric space (X, d) as follows. Let $C(X)$ be the space of continuous real-valued functions on X , with the topology of uniform convergence on compacts and let $\tilde{C}(X)$ be the quotient of this space obtained by considering two functions equivalent if they differ by a constant. Then, one can use the distance function $d(\cdot, x)$ to inject the space X into $\tilde{C}(X)$. If X is proper, meaning that closed balls are compact, then this map is an embedding. The topological boundary in $\tilde{C}(X)$ of the image of this map is called the *horofunction boundary* of X , and its elements are called *horofunctions*.

Note that this construction is an additive version of the construction of the Martin boundary in probabilistic potential theory [4] and of the Thurston boundary of Teichmüller space [6]. The analogy with the Martin boundary was developed in [1], where, in particular, the analogue of the *minimal* Martin boundary was found to be the set of limits of *almost-geodesics*. An almost-geodesic, as defined by Rieffel [8], is a map γ from an unbounded set $T \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ containing 0 to X , such that for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$|d(\gamma(t), \gamma(s)) + d(\gamma(s), \gamma(0)) - t| < \epsilon$$

for all t and s large enough with $t \geq s$. Rieffel called the limits of such paths Busemann points. See [1] for a slightly different definition of almost-geodesic which nevertheless gives rise to the same set of Busemann points.

Rieffel comments that it is an interesting question as to when all boundary points of a metric space are Busemann points and asks whether this is the case for general finite-dimensional normed spaces. We answer this question in the negative and give a necessary and sufficient criterion for it to be the case.

We exploit the fact that horofunctions in a normed space are convex; our methods are those of convex geometry, in particular polarity.

Although we have defined horofunctions as equivalence classes of functions, in the remainder of the paper we only consider their representatives taking the value 0 at the origin.

Date: February 2, 2008.

Key words and phrases. Minkowski space, horoball, max-plus algebra, metric boundary, Busemann function.

Let V be an arbitrary finite-dimensional normed space with unit ball B . In this paper, all vector spaces are assumed real. For any extreme set E of the dual unit ball B° and point p of V , define the function $f_{E,p}$ from the dual space V^* to $[0, \infty]$ by

$$f_{E,p}(q) := I_E(q) + \langle q|p \rangle - \inf_{y \in E} \langle y|p \rangle \quad \text{for all } q \in V^*.$$

Here I_E is the indicator function, taking value 0 on E and $+\infty$ everywhere else.

Our first theorem characterises the Busemann points of V as the Legendre–Fenchel transforms of these functions.

Theorem 1.1. *The set of Busemann points of a finite-dimensional normed space $(V, \|\cdot\|)$ is*

$$\{f_{E,p}^* \mid E \text{ is a proper extreme set of } B^\circ \text{ and } p \in V\}.$$

We use this knowledge to characterise those norms for which all horofunctions are Busemann points.

Theorem 1.2. *A necessary and sufficient condition for every horofunction of a finite-dimensional normed space to be a Busemann point is that the set of extreme sets of the dual unit ball be closed in the Painlevé–Kuratowski topology.*

In this paper the symmetry of the norm plays no role; the results hold equally well for non-symmetric norms.

Karlsson *et al.* determined the horofunction boundary in the case when the norm is polyhedral [7]. In [2], Andreev makes a connection between the horofunction boundary of finite-dimensional normed spaces and flag directed sequences. The question of when all horofunctions are Busemann points was investigated in a general setting by Webster and Winchester. Their paper [10] contains a criterion for this to be so when the metric is given by a graph, and [9] contains a similar criterion for general metric spaces.

2. PRELIMINARIES

For a reference on convex analysis, the reader may consult [3].

We will use the Painlevé–Kuratowski topology on the set of closed sets of a finite-dimensional normed space V . In this topology, a sequence of closed sets $(C_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is said to converge to a closed set C if the upper and lower closed limits of the sequence agree and equal C . These limits are defined to be, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ls } C_n &:= \bigcap_{n \geq 0} \text{cl} \left(\bigcup_{i > n} C_i \right) \quad \text{and} \\ \text{Li } C_n &:= \bigcap_{i \geq 0} \left\{ \text{cl} \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} C_{n_i} \mid (n_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ is an increasing sequence in } \mathbb{N} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

An alternative characterisation of convergence is that $(C_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to C if and only if each of the following hold:

- for each $x \in C$, there exists $x_n \in C_n$ for n large enough, such that $(x_n)_n$ converges to x .
- if $(C_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a subsequence of the sequence of sets and $x_k \in C_{n_k}$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then convergence of $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ to x implies that $x \in C$.

The Painlevé–Kuratowski topology can be used to define a topology on the space of lower-semicontinuous functions as follows. Recall that the epigraph of a function f on V is the set $\{(x, \alpha) \in V \times \mathbb{R} \mid \alpha \geq f(x)\}$. A sequence of lower-semicontinuous functions is declared to be convergent in the epigraph topology if the associated epigraphs converge in the Painlevé–Kuratowski topology on $V \times \mathbb{R}$. For proper metric spaces, the epigraph topology is identical to the Attouch–Wets topology.

The *Legendre–Fenchel transform* of a function $f : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ is the function $f^* : V^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ defined by

$$f^*(y) := \sup_{x \in V} (\langle y|x \rangle - f(x)) \quad \text{for all } y \in V^*.$$

The Legendre–Fenchel transform is a bijection from the set of proper lower-semicontinuous convex functions to itself and is continuous in the epigraph topology.

Let $B := \{x \in V \mid \|x\| \leq 1\}$ be the closed unit ball of the normed space $(V, \|\cdot\|)$. The dual unit ball is the set of linear forms

$$B^\circ := \{y \in V^* \mid \langle y|x \rangle \geq -1 \text{ for all } x \in B\}.$$

A convex subset E of a convex set C is said to be an *extreme set* if the endpoints of any line segment in C are contained in E whenever any interior point of the line segment is.

Let

$$^*\mathcal{A} := \{f_{E,p} \mid E \text{ is an extreme set of } B^\circ \text{ and } p \in V\}.$$

Note that $^*\mathcal{A}$ is precisely the set of functions that are affine on some extreme set of B° , take the value $+\infty$ everywhere else, and have infimum zero. Let

$$\phi_z(x) := \|z - x\| - \|z\| \quad \text{for all } x \text{ and } z \text{ in } V.$$

Define

$$\mathcal{D} := \{\phi_z \mid z \in V\} = \{\|z - \cdot\| - \|z\| \mid z \in V\}.$$

Also, let

$$\mathcal{A} := \{f^* \mid f \in ^*\mathcal{A}\} \quad \text{and} \quad ^*\mathcal{D} := \{f^* \mid f \in \mathcal{D}\}$$

be the sets of Legendre–Fenchel transforms of the functions in $^*\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{D}$.

The Legendre–Fenchel transform of $\phi_0(x) = \|\cdot - x\|$ can be calculated to be $\phi_0^*(y) = I_{B^\circ}(y)$. Also, by expressing the norm $\|\cdot\|$ as the transform of its transform, one may arrive at the formula

$$\|z\| = - \inf_{y \in B^\circ} \langle y|z \rangle.$$

Using these, one can calculate the transform of $\phi_z = \phi_0(\cdot - z) - \|z\|$ to be

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_z^*(y) &= \phi_0^*(y) + \langle y|z \rangle + \|z\| \\ &= I_{B^\circ}(y) + \langle y|z \rangle - \inf_{x \in B^\circ} \langle x|z \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

So ϕ_z^* is in $^*\mathcal{A}$ for all $z \in V$, and hence $\mathcal{D}$ is a subset of $\mathcal{A}$.

Denote by $\text{cl } \mathcal{D}$ the horofunction compactification of V , that is, the closure of $\mathcal{D}$ in the topology of uniform convergence on compact sets. As the limit of a sequence of convex 1–Lipschitz functions, each element of $\text{cl } \mathcal{D}$ is also convex and 1–Lipschitz. Since the functions in $\mathcal{D}$ are equi–Lipschitzian, convergence of a sequence of such functions uniformly on compacts is equivalent to convergence in the epigraph topology, see Lemma 7.1.2 and Proposition 7.1.3 of [3]. So $\text{cl } \mathcal{D}$ is also the closure

of $\mathcal{D}$ in the epigraph topology, which we will find more convenient to use in the remainder of the paper.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

The proof of our characterisation of Busemann points will require a result from [1]: a horofunction is a Busemann point if and only if it is not the minimum of two 1-Lipschitz functions each different from it.

Lemma 3.1. *Each Busemann point is contained in $\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{D}$.*

Proof. Let g be in $(\text{cl } \mathcal{D}) \setminus \mathcal{A}$. So g is convex and 1-Lipschitz. Its Legendre–Fenchel transform g^* therefore takes the value $+\infty$ outside B° . Since g^* is not in ${}^*\mathcal{A}$, we can therefore find x, y , and z in B° and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$y = (1 - \lambda)x + \lambda z \quad (1)$$

and $g^*(y) < (1 - \lambda)g^*(x) + \lambda g^*(z)$. In fact, we can find real numbers a and b such that $a < g^*(x)$ and $b < g^*(z)$, and $g^*(y) < (1 - \lambda)a + \lambda b$. It follows from the latter inequality that

$$\langle y|p \rangle - g(p) < (1 - \lambda)a + \lambda b \quad \text{for all } p \in V. \quad (2)$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_1 &:= \left\{ p \in V \mid \langle x|p \rangle - a \geq g(p) \right\} \quad \text{and} \\ \Pi_2 &:= \left\{ p \in V \mid \langle z|p \rangle - b \geq g(p) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $p \in \Pi_1$. Taking the definition of Π_1 and substituting in the expression for x obtained from (1) we get

$$\frac{1}{1 - \lambda} \langle y|p \rangle - \frac{\lambda}{1 - \lambda} \langle z|p \rangle - a \geq g(p).$$

We use the bound on $g(p)$ given by (2) to get, after some canceling,

$$\langle y|p \rangle - \langle z|p \rangle > (1 - \lambda)(a - b).$$

We use (2) again to deduce that

$$-\langle z|p \rangle > -g(p) - b.$$

Therefore p is not in Π_2 . We have proved that Π_1 and Π_2 have no element in common.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} g_1 &:= \max(g, \langle x|\cdot \rangle - a) \quad \text{and} \\ g_2 &:= \max(g, \langle z|\cdot \rangle - b). \end{aligned}$$

Each of g_1 and g_2 are 1-Lipschitz since g is 1-Lipschitz and x and z are in B° . It is immediate from the result of the preceding paragraph that $g = \min(g_1, g_2)$.

Let p be in the sub-differential of g^* at x , which means that

$$\langle q - x|p \rangle + g^*(x) \leq g^*(q) \quad \text{for all } q \in V^*.$$

Taking the Legendre–Fenchel transform, we get

$$g(s) \leq I_{\{p\}}(s) + \langle x|p \rangle - g^*(x) \quad \text{for all } s \in V.$$

Now we evaluate at $s = p$ and use the fact that $a < g^*(x)$ to conclude that $g(p) < \langle x|p \rangle - a$. Therefore g_1 is different from g . One can prove in a similar

way that g_2 is different from g . Thus we have shown that g is the minimum of two 1-Lipschitz functions each different from it, and so g cannot be a Busemann point. $\square$

An exposed face of a convex set is the intersection of the set with a supporting hyperplane. The following lemma relating this concept to that of extreme set is probably known, but we can find no reference to it in the literature.

Lemma 3.2. *Let V be a finite-dimensional vector space. A set E is an extreme set of a convex set $C \subset V$ if and only if there is a finite sequence of convex sets $F_0, \dots, F_n$ such that $F_0 = C$, $F_n = E$, and F_{i+1} is an exposed face of F_i for all $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$.*

Proof. Let E be an extreme set of C . If E contains a relative interior point of C , then the extremality of E implies that it equals C . On the contrary, if E is contained entirely within the relative boundary of C , then, since E is convex, by the separation theorem it must be contained within an exposed face F_1 of C . Since $E \subset F_1 \subset C$ and E is an extreme set of C , it must also be an extreme set of F_1 .

We may apply the same procedure repeatedly to get the required sequence of sets $F_0, F_1, \dots, F_n$ such that each is an exposed face of the previous one and $F_n = E$.

Conversely, assume such a sequence exists. Recall that an exposed face is an extreme set and that so also is an extreme set of an extreme set. These two facts imply that E is an extreme set of C . $\square$

In the next lemma we will use the following two properties of the epigraph topology. Firstly, if $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of proper lower-semicontinuous convex functions converging to a limit f such that each takes the value $+\infty$ outside a fixed bounded region, then $\inf f_n$ converges to $\inf f$ [3, Lemma 7.5.3]. Secondly, if in addition g is a real-valued lower-semicontinuous convex function that is continuous at a point where f is finite, then $f_n + g$ converges to $f + g$ [3, Lemma 7.4.5].

For each convex subset C of V^* and point $p \in V$, define

$$|p|_C := - \inf_{q \in C} \langle q, p \rangle.$$

Observe that $|\cdot|_{B^\circ} = \|\cdot\|$. However, $|\cdot|_C$ will not in general be a norm. A simple calculation shows that $f_{E,p}^* = |p - \cdot|_E - |p|_E$ for all extreme sets E of B° and points p of V .

Lemma 3.3. *Let F be an exposed face of a compact convex set C in V^* . Suppose that there exists a sequence $(p_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in V and $\epsilon > 0$ such that*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} |p_{i+1} - p_i|_F \leq |p_n - p_0|_F + \epsilon \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N} \quad (3)$$

and $|p_n - \cdot|_F - |p_n|_F$ converges pointwise to a lower semicontinuous convex function g . Then there exists a sequence $(q_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in V and $\epsilon' > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} |q_{i+1} - q_i|_C \leq |q_n - q_0|_C + \epsilon' \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N} \quad (4)$$

and $|q_n - \cdot|_C - |q_n|_C$ converges pointwise to g .

Proof. There exists an affine function f from V^* to $\mathbb{R}$ that takes the value zero on F and is positive on C . Let $\hat{f} := f - f(0)$ be the linear functional on V^* with the same gradient.

Let $(z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of points in V such that $Z := \bigcup_n \{z_n\}$ is dense in V and contains the origin. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define $q_n := p_n + \lambda_n \hat{f}$, where the sequence $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of reals is chosen so that, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|q_{n+1} - q_n|_C - |q_{n+1} - q_n|_F < \frac{1}{2^n} \quad (5)$$

$$\text{and} \quad |q_n - z|_C - |q_n - z|_F < \frac{1}{n} \quad \text{for all } z \in \{z_0, \dots, z_n\}. \quad (6)$$

To see that it is possible to choose the λ_n in this way requires the following argument. As λ tends to infinity, $\lambda f + I_C$ converges in the epigraph topology to I_F . So $\lambda f + I_C + \langle \cdot | r \rangle$ converges in the epigraph topology to $I_F + \langle \cdot | r \rangle$ for any point $r \in V$. Therefore the infimum of that function converges to the infimum of $I_F + \langle \cdot | r \rangle$, which is the same as the infimum of $\lambda f + I_F + \langle \cdot | r \rangle$ for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. We now use the definitions of $\hat{f}$, $|\cdot|_C$, and $|\cdot|_F$ to deduce that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} (|\lambda \hat{f} + r|_C - |\lambda \hat{f} + r|_F) = 0$$

From this and the fact that, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the set $\{z_0, \dots, z_n\}$ is finite, we see that (6) can be satisfied by choosing λ_n large enough. Also, (5) can be satisfied using large enough λ_{n+1} once λ_n has been fixed. So one must choose $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \dots$ in that order.

Because f takes the value 0 on F , we have

$$|q_{i+1} - q_i|_F = (\lambda_{i+1} - \lambda_i)f(0) + |p_{i+1} - p_i|_F \quad \text{for all } i \in \mathbb{N} \quad (7)$$

$$\text{and} \quad |q_n - q_0|_F = (\lambda_n - \lambda_0)f(0) + |p_n - p_0|_F \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (8)$$

Also, since $F \subset C$,

$$|q_n - q_0|_C \geq |q_n - q_0|_F \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (9)$$

Combining (5), (9), (7), (8), and (3), we get

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} |q_{i+1} - q_i|_C - |q_n - q_0|_C < \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{2^i} + \epsilon \leq 2 + \epsilon. \quad (10)$$

So $(q_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies (4) with $\epsilon' := 2 + \epsilon$.

Let $u \in Z$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough, each of 0 and u are in $\{z_0, \dots, z_n\}$. So, from (6) and the fact that $|\cdot|_C \geq |\cdot|_F$, we get

$$-\frac{1}{n} \leq |q_n - u|_C - |q_n|_C - |q_n - u|_F + |q_n|_F \leq \frac{1}{n} \quad \text{for all } n \text{ large enough.}$$

But, since f takes the value 0 on F , we have $|q_n - u|_F - |q_n|_F = |p_n - u|_F - |p_n|_F$, and by hypothesis this converges to $g(u)$ as n tends to infinity. We conclude that $|q_n - u|_C - |q_n|_C$ also converges to $g(u)$ as n tends to infinity. Note that $|q_n - \cdot|_C - |q_n|_C$ is 1-Lipschitz with respect to any norm on V since its Legendre–Fenchel transform $\langle \cdot | q_n \rangle + |q_n|_C + I_C$ takes the value $+\infty$ outside a compact set. Therefore, the pointwise convergence of this function on a dense subset of V implies convergence everywhere. $\square$

Lemma 3.4. *Every function in $\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{D}$ is a Busemann point.*

Proof. Let $g \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{D}$. So $g^* = f_{E,p}$ for some proper extreme subset E of B° and point p of V . By Lemma 3.2, there exists a finite sequence of sets $B^\circ = F_0 \supset F_1 \supset \dots \supset F_n = E$ such that F_{i+1} is an exposed face of F_i for each $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$.

Define the sequence $p_n := p$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. All the conditions of Lemma 3.3 are satisfied, taking $F = E$, $C = F_{n-1}$, $\epsilon = 0$, and $g = f_{E,p}^*$. By applying Lemma 3.3 repeatedly, we arrive at a sequence $(q_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in V and $\epsilon' > 0$ satisfying the conclusion of this lemma with $C = B^\circ$. So, the sequence of points $(q_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to the function $f_{E,p}^*$, which is therefore a horofunction. Inequality (4) says that $(q_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an almost-geodesic in the sense of [1]. Although this notion of almost-geodesic is slightly different from that of Rieffel, it gives rise to the same set of Busemann points [1, Corollary 7.13]. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. This follows from Lemmas 3.1 and 3.4. $\square$

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

Lemma 4.1. *If $\mathcal{A}$ is closed, then the set of extreme subsets of B° is closed in the Painlevé–Kuratowski topology.*

Proof. Let $(E_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of extreme sets of B° converging to some set E . The sequence of indicator functions $(I_{E_n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to I_E . But each of the functions $I_{E_n}; n \in \mathbb{N}$ is in ${}^*\mathcal{A}$, and so $I_E \in {}^*\mathcal{A}$. It follows that E is an extreme set. $\square$

Lemma 4.2. *If the set of extreme subsets of B° is closed in the Painlevé–Kuratowski topology, then $\mathcal{A}$ is closed.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.4, we have $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{A} \subset \text{cl } \mathcal{D}$. So to prove that $\mathcal{A}$ is closed, it suffices to prove that the limit f of any convergent sequence of functions $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in ${}^*\mathcal{D}$ is in ${}^*\mathcal{A}$.

Let x and z be distinct points in B° and let $y := (1-\lambda)x + \lambda z$ for some $\lambda \in (0, 1)$. We must show that $f(y) = (1-\lambda)f(x) + \lambda f(z)$. Since f is convex, there is nothing to prove if $f(y) = \infty$. We shall therefore assume that $f(y)$ is finite.

Let $|\cdot|$ be any norm on V^* . We claim that there exists a sequence of points $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in B° and a constant $\delta > 0$ such that the following hold

- $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to y ,
- $f_n(y_n)$ converges to $f(y)$,
- for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, y_n is in some extreme set E_n and is a distance at least δ from ∂E_n , the relative boundary of E_n .

Indeed, we know that there exists some sequence $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in B° converging to y and satisfying

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(a_n) = f(y). \quad (11)$$

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let E_n be the smallest extreme set containing a_n and let

$$\delta_n := \inf_{w \in \partial E_n} |a_n - w|. \quad (12)$$

If $\delta := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta_n$ is positive, then our claim holds for some subsequence of $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, so assume that $\delta = 0$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $b_n \in \partial E_n$ be such that

$$|a_n - b_n| = \delta_n. \quad (13)$$

Observe that $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to y as $n \rightarrow \infty$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let c_n be the point, different from b_n , where the line $a_n b_n$ meets ∂E_n .

Define the sequence of points $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ by

$$s_n := \begin{cases} b_n, & \text{if } f_n(b_n) \leq f_n(a_n) + \sqrt{\delta_n}, \\ c_n, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

Let $(n_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence of n for which the first case in this definition occurs and let $(m_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence for which the second occurs.

From equations (11) and (14) and the fact that δ_{n_i} tends to zero as $i \rightarrow \infty$, we see that

$$\limsup_{i \rightarrow \infty} f_{n_i}(b_{n_i}) \leq f(y).$$

That the corresponding limit infimum is bounded below by the same quantity follows immediately from the convergence of b_n to y and the convergence of f_n to f in the epigraph topology.

Now let m be such that the second case in (14) occurs for $n = m$. Since f_m is affine on B° and $f_m(c_m) \geq 0$, we have

$$\frac{f_m(a_m)}{|c_m - a_m|} \geq \frac{f_m(b_m) - f_m(a_m)}{|b_m - a_m|} > \frac{\sqrt{\delta_m}}{\delta_m} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta_m}}.$$

Using (11) and the convergence of δ_n to zero, we conclude that $|c_{m_i} - a_{m_i}|$ tends to zero as $i \rightarrow \infty$. So c_{m_i} converges to y . It follows that

$$\liminf_{i \rightarrow \infty} f_{m_i}(c_{m_i}) \geq f(y).$$

We also have that the corresponding limit supremum is no greater than $f(y)$ because, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $f_{m_i}(b_{m_i}) > f_{m_i}(a_{m_i})$ and the affineness of f_{m_i} then implies that $f_{m_i}(c_{m_i}) \leq f_{m_i}(a_{m_i})$.

The results of the previous two paragraphs imply that $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to y and that $f_n(s_n)$ converges to $f(y)$. Note that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, s_n is in the boundary of E_n , and hence the smallest extreme set containing s_n has dimension strictly smaller than that of E_n , unless E_n is a singleton. So if we iterate the procedure constructing $(s_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, we arrive at a sequence $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ which either consists entirely of extreme points or contains a subsequence satisfying our claim. But the former is impossible since $\{y\}$ would then be the limit of the extreme sets $\{y_n\}; n \in \mathbb{N}$ and therefore, by our assumption, extreme, contradicting the fact that y is a convex combination of two points in B° distinct from it. Thus we have proved our claim.

It follows from our claim and the non-negativity of each function f_n that f_n is Lipschitz on E_n with Lipschitz constant $f_n(y_n)/\delta$. Note that this constant goes to the limit $f(y)/\delta$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. So we may find a constant l such that f_n is l -Lipschitz on E_n for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let F be a limit point of the sequence $(E_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. By assumption, F must be an extreme set. Taking a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that $(E_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to F . Since $y_n \in E_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to y , we have $y \in F$. It follows that each of x and z are in F . So there exist sequences $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converging to x and z respectively such that x_n and z_n are in E_n for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f_n(x_n)$ and $f_n(z_n)$ converge respectively to $f(x)$ and $f(z)$. Take $y'_n := (1 - \lambda)x_n + \lambda z_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $y'_n \in E_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and y'_n converges to y . Since, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the function f_n is Lipschitz on E_n with Lipschitz constant l and $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(y'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converge to the same limit, $f_n(y'_n)$

must converge to the same limit as $f_n(y_n)$, which is $f(y)$. So

$$\begin{aligned} f(y) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(y'_n) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[(1 - \lambda)f_n(x_n) + \lambda f_n(z_n) \right] \\ &= (1 - \lambda)f(x) + \lambda f(z). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that the set on which f is finite is an extreme set and that f is affine on this set. So $f \in {}^*\mathcal{A}$. $\square$

Lemma 4.3. *The set of functions $\mathcal{A}$ is closed in the epigraph topology if and only if the set of extreme subsets of B° is closed in the Painlevé–Kuratowski topology.*

Proof. This follows from Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Suppose the set of extreme subsets of B° is closed. Then $\mathcal{A}$ is closed by Lemma 4.3, and since $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{A} \subset \text{cl } \mathcal{D}$ by Lemma 3.4, we have that $\mathcal{A}$ equals $\text{cl } \mathcal{D}$. We conclude that the set of horofunctions $(\text{cl } \mathcal{D}) \setminus \mathcal{D}$ equals $\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{D}$, which by Theorem 1.1 is the set of Busemann points. The converse can be shown by reversing the chain of argument. $\square$

5. EXAMPLES

Example 5.1. *In dimension two, the set of extreme sets of any convex set is always closed. Therefore, horofunctions of a two-dimensional normed space are always Busemann points.*

Example 5.2. *In dimension three, define the norm*

$$\|(x, y, z)\| := \max(|x| + |z|, \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}).$$

The unit ball of this norm is

$$B := \left\{ (x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid |x| + |z| \leq 1 \text{ and } x^2 + y^2 \leq 1 \right\}.$$

The dual unit ball B° is the polar of B and is most easily calculated by recalling that the polar of an intersection equals the closed convex hull of the polars. Thus, B° is the convex hull of the square with corners $(\pm 1, 0, \pm 1)$ and the circle $\{(x, y, z) \mid x^2 + y^2 = 1, z = 0\}$.

For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $p_n := (\cos(1/n), \sin(1/n), 0)$. Observe that the sequence of extreme sets $(\{p_n\})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges to the set $\{(1, 0, 0)\}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. However, this set is not extreme.

So from Theorem 1.2 we would expect the existence of a horofunction that is not a Busemann point. Indeed, the function $f : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (x, y, z) \mapsto -x$ is such a function.

To see it is a horofunction, observe that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the sequence of functions $\|mp_n - \cdot\| - \|mp_n\|$ converges, as m tends to infinity, to the function $\xi_n : \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, p \mapsto -p_n \cdot p$. Hence ξ_n is a horofunction for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and so f is also a horofunction since ξ_n converges to f as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

To see that f is not a Busemann point, it suffices to write it as the minimum of the two functions

$$f_1((x, y, z)) := \begin{cases} -x + z, & \text{if } z \geq 0, \\ -x, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and

$$f_2((x, y, z)) := \begin{cases} -x, & \text{if } z \geq 0, \\ -x - z, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

both of which are 1-Lipschitz with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|$.

Example 5.3. In dimension three, the set of extreme sets of a convex set is closed if and only if the set of extreme points is. So, for an example showing that closure of the set of extreme points of the dual ball is not sufficient for all horofunctions to be Busemann points, we must go to dimension four.

We define a norm $\|\cdot\|$ having as dual ball B° the closed convex hull of the four circles

$$S_1^\pm := \{(x, y, \pm 1, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^4 \mid x^2 + y^2 = 1\}$$

$$S_2^\pm := \{(\pm 1, 0, w, z) \in \mathbb{R}^4 \mid w^2 + z^2 = 1\}.$$

The set of extreme points of B° is the union of the four circles, which is closed.

For each $\theta \in (0, \pi/2)$, consider the function $f_\theta : \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$f_\theta(x, y, w, z) := x \cos \theta + y \sin \theta + z(1 - \cos \theta).$$

It is easy to show that f_θ does not take any value greater than 1 on B° . Furthermore, for $\theta \in (0, \pi/2)$, f_θ takes value 1 on the set

$$T_\theta := \text{conv}[(\cos \theta, \sin \theta, -1, 0), (\cos \theta, \sin \theta, 1, 0), (1, 0, 0, 1)].$$

Therefore this set is a face and hence an extreme set of B° . As θ tends to zero, T_θ converges to the set

$$\text{conv}[(1, 0, -1, 0), (1, 0, 1, 0), (1, 0, 0, 1)].$$

However this set is not an extreme set, as can be seen by observing that it both contains a relative interior point of $\text{conv } S_2^+$ and is a proper subset of this set.

So the set of extreme sets of B° is not closed.

There is enough information in the preceding paragraphs to see that

$$g : \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (x, y, w, z) \mapsto \max[x - w, x + w, x + z]$$

is a horofunction and that it can be written as the minimum of two 1-Lipschitz functions, for example

$$g_1 : \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (x, y, w, z) \mapsto \max\left[x - w, x + w, x + z, x + \frac{w}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{z}{\sqrt{2}}\right]$$

and

$$g_2 : \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, (x, y, w, z) \mapsto \max\left[x - w, x + w, x + z, x - \frac{w}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{z}{\sqrt{2}}\right].$$

Example 5.4. It was shown in [7] that all horofunctions of a finite-dimensional normed space with polyhedral norm are Busemann points. One can recover this result quite easily from Theorem 1.2 by observing that the dual ball in this case is also polyhedral and has therefore a finite number of extreme sets.

REFERENCES

- [1] Marianne Akian, Stephane Gaubert, and Cormac Walsh. The max-plus Martin boundary. Preprint. arXiv:math.MG/0412408, 2004.
- [2] P. D. Andreev. Ideal closures of Busemann space and singular Minkowski space, 2004. arXiv:math.GT/0405121.
- [3] Gerald Beer. *Topologies on closed and closed convex sets*, volume 268 of *Mathematics and its Applications*. Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1993.
- [4] E. B. Dynkin. Boundary theory of Markov processes (the discrete case). *Russian Math. Surveys*, 24(7):1–42, 1969.
- [5] M. Gromov. Hyperbolic manifolds, groups and actions. In *Riemann surfaces and related topics: Proceedings of the 1978 Stony Brook Conference (State Univ. New York, Stony Brook, N.Y., 1978)*, volume 97 of *Ann. of Math. Stud.*, pages 183–213, Princeton, N.J., 1981. Princeton Univ. Press.
- [6] Vadim A. Kaimanovich and Howard Masur. The Poisson boundary of the mapping class group. *Invent. Math.*, 125(2):221–264, 1996.
- [7] A. Karlsson, V. Metz, and G. Noskov. Horoballs in simplices and Minkowski spaces, 2004. Preprint.
- [8] Marc A. Rieffel. Group C^* -algebras as compact quantum metric spaces. *Doc. Math.*, 7:605–651 (electronic), 2002.
- [9] Corran Webster and Adam Winchester. Busemann points of metric spaces, 2005. Preprint.
- [10] Corran Webster and Adam Winchester. Busemann Points of Infinite Graphs, 2006. arXiv:math.MG/0309291.

INRIA, DOMAINE DE VOLUCEAU, 78153 LE CHESNAY CÉDEX, FRANCE
E-mail address: `cormac.walsh@inria.fr`